

REMARKS

Petition for a three month extension of time has been filed as a separate paper and a copy is attached hereto.

The rejection of claims 9 and 10 for indefiniteness is believed to be moot in view of the current amendments to claims 1 and 9 and cancellation of claim 10. See paragraph 0029 of applicant's specification.

The rejections of claims 1-16 for anticipation by Hancock et al. are respectfully traversed. In the present invention the different levels of administrative districts (hierarchy) for a given address are displayed as a menu allowing selection at any level. This feature allows the input of a new address to be arbitrarily started at any administrative level, as taught in paragraph 0029 of applicant's specification. Hancock neither discloses or suggests such a feature, i.e., an address in the form of a hierarchy of level of administrative districts for a single address and presented as a selection menu on an input screen.

With regard to a display of an address with different administrative levels as "item fields", the Examiner cites, in Hancock et al, column 5, lines 59-67, column 6, lines 1-9, column 14, lines 56-63 and "MAC2" in Fig. 12C. Column 5, lines 58-67 relates to data structure in different files, not to display of an input screen. Column 6, 1-9 mentions input of "the map code or district name" as "regional information," but does not describe an input screen, much less an input screen of the type defined by the pending claims. Finally, Fig. 12C does show an address for "McDonald's #2" in the form of a hierarchy of administrative levels. However, the only input involved in use of screen 12C, as described at column 14, lines 56-63, is input of the proprietary name "MAC2". There is no suggestion of a capability of input of a new address by selection of any one of the administrative levels.

With regard to claim 5, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 29-46 and column 6, lines 1-9. Column 4, lines 26-48 of Hancock refers to a “hierarchical grid” (not an address presented in the form of different administrative levels) presented as a code with different levels represented by double digit numbers separated by decimal points. The teaching is in no way suggestive of the features mentioned above with regard to claim 1, much less the additional feature recited by claim 5 wherein selection of one level will automatically trigger change of the lower levels of the displayed address hierarchy. As noted above, column 6, lines 1-9 addresses the input of a “map code or district name” and does not in any way describe a display or changing of a display with respect to levels of administrative districts below the selected level.

Claim 11 also recites the output of a selection menu on the input page in the form of a hierarchy of different administrative levels. As noted above, Hancock nowhere teaches such a control means for a display of such an input page. Figures 8 and 10 of Hancock represent storage files, not a display, and present listings of different locations, not a list of different administrative levels of a given location. The teaching in column 4, lines 12-14 relates to a “hierarchical grid” of different levels, not an address consisting of levels of different administrative districts, and is in no sense a description of an input screen of the type defined by claim 11. As noted above, the teaching in column 14, lines 56-60 refers to a single option for input, i.e. input of a proprietary name.

Finally, the rejection of claims 14, 15, and 16 over Hancock is respectfully traversed for substantially the same reasons mentioned above. The various teachings of Hancock cited by the Examiner relate mostly to structure of stored data and, to the extent that they are at all relevant to an input screen, are in no way suggestive of an input screen wherein the items of a menu correspond to levels of administrative districts for a single address.

In conclusion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of record with a view toward allowance of the claims as amended.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS

1/3/2006
Date

George A. Loud
George A. Loud
Reg. No. 25,814

Atty Dkt: CHIB3001

625 Slaters Lane
Fourth Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 683-0500